

STATEMENT OF THE CLAIMS

1. (currently amended) A method for determining the correct escheat state for abandoned property, said method comprising:

~~starting with an~~ inputting a property owner address into a computer having a processor;

~~,interrogating a data base apparatus of property owner addresses, by inputting the address;~~

the processor comparing the ~~addresses~~ property owner address, including street address, city, state, and zip code, to a US Postal Service certified data base apparatus; and

the processor assigning a probable escheat state based on the comparison of ~~street address, city, state, and zip code from the data base of the~~ property owner addresses with the US Postal Service certified data base apparatus.

2. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor assigning a confidence code to the escheat state.

3. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor making corrections to property owner ~~addresses~~ address based on the comparison.

4. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor filtering non-address information from the property owner ~~data base~~
address prior to said step of comparing.

5. (original) The method according to claim 4, wherein:

the non-address information includes legal designations of the type of property
ownership.

6. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor assigning at least one alternate escheat state based on the
comparison.

7. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor comparing the property owner address to a list of foreign country
names; and

the processor flagging the property owner addresses which include foreign
country names that match the list.

8. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor comparing the ~~addresses~~ property owner address to a list of non-
state location designations.

9. (currently amended) The method according to claim 3, further comprising:

the processor indicating which addresses were corrected.

10. (currently amended) The method according to claim 9, further comprising:

the processor indicating the type of correction made.

11. (currently amended) The method according to claim 2, wherein:

said confidence code represents 100% ~~of the address from the data base of~~ if the property owners owner address has an exact match in the US Postal Service certified data base apparatus, and

said confidence code is based on a ratio of possible matches when an exact match is not found.

12. (currently amended) The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

the processor correcting the property owner address zip code when city and state are correct but the zip code is incorrect by the comparison.

13. (currently amended) The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

the processor correcting the property owner address state when the city and zip code are correct but the state is incorrect by the comparison.

14. (currently amended) The method according to claim 11, further comprising:

the processor correcting the property owner address state when the zip code is incorrect and the state is ambiguous because the city name exists in more than one state, said step of correcting the property owner address state including a statistical analysis by the processor of the number of zip codes for the city in each state having the city.

15. (currently amended) The method according to claim 14, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected high threshold by the processor.

16. (currently amended) The method according to claim 15, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison by the processor to a user selected low threshold.

17. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

prior to said step of the processor comparing, the processor filtering the property owner addresses based on user supplied suppression data.

18. (currently amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising:

the processor indicating how the probable escheat state was assigned.

19. (currently amended) The method according to claim 2, further comprising:

the processor generating a report that defines the composition of ~~the~~ an abandoned property database and summarizes metrics by the confidence code.

20. (original) The method according to claim 1, wherein:

said method is performed with a computer coupled to the Internet.

21. (currently amended) An apparatus for determining the correct escheat state for abandoned property, said apparatus comprising:

a data base server including means for comparing an uploaded address to a list of addresses stored in a data base;

a network server coupled to said data base server;

a network coupled to the network server;

a remote terminal coupled to the network, said terminal including means for uploading an address to said data base server via said network and said network server;
and

a printer coupled to said terminal, wherein

said terminal uploads an address to said data base server, said data base server compares the uploaded addresses to addresses in the data base and downloads the result of the comparison to said terminal, the results of the comparison being output by said terminal to said printer, the results including the indication of an escheat state and a probability that the indication is correct.

22. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, wherein:

the results include a confidence code.

23. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, wherein:

the data base server corrects the uploaded address based on the comparison.

24. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, wherein:

the data base server filters non-address information from the uploaded address prior to comparing the uploaded addresses to addresses in the data base.

25. (new) The apparatus according to claim 24, wherein:

the non-address information includes legal designations of the type of property ownership.

26. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server assigning at least one alternate escheat state based on the comparison and the results including the at least one alternate escheat state.

27. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server comparing the uploaded address to a list of foreign country names; and

the data base server flagging the addresses which include foreign country names that match the list.

28. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server comparing the addresses to a list of non-state location designations.

29. (new) The apparatus according to claim 23, further comprising:

the data base server indicating which addresses were corrected.

30. (new) The apparatus according to claim 29, further comprising:

the data base server indicating the type of correction made.

31. (new) The apparatus according to claim 22, wherein:

said confidence code represents 100% if the uploaded address has an exact match in the US Postal Service certified data base, and

said confidence code is based on a ratio of possible matches when an exact match is not found.

32. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server correcting the uploaded address zip code when city and state are correct but the zip code is incorrect by the comparison.

33. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server correcting the uploaded address state when the city and zip code are correct but the state is incorrect by the comparison.

34. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server correcting the uploaded address state when the zip code is incorrect and the state is ambiguous because the city name exists in more than one state, the data base server performing a statistical analysis of the number of zip codes for the city in each state having the city.

35. (new) The apparatus according to claim 34, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected high threshold.

36. (new) The apparatus according to claim 35, wherein:

the statistical analysis includes comparison to a user selected low threshold.

37. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the data base server filtering the uploaded addresses based on user supplied suppression data.

38. (new) The apparatus according to claim 21, further comprising:

the results indicating how the probable escheat state was assigned.